40. That rough pattahs should contain full particulars of holdings.

Mr. Punnoose Chacko (Todupuzha) requested that fuller particulars of properties might be ordered to be entered in the rough pattahs than was the practice at present.

Reply.—Rough pattahs in the form now fixed contain all the necessary particulars. If more information is wanted, parties may apply for and get copies of chittas.

41. Investment of Tahsildars with power to make corrections in the pattahs issued by the Settlement department.

Mr. N. Padmanabha Pillai (Chengannur) represented that there were several patent errors in the pattahs now issued by the Settlement department and parties could be saved the trouble of seeking remedy in civil courts, if Tahsildars were invested with the power of making corrections in the same.

Mr. K. Kochu Thomman (Chengannur) spoke in support.

Reply.—The pattahs issued by the Settlement department are final until there is change of ownership, in which case, the necessary transfers of registry will be effected by the Tahsildars. The Revenue authorities cannot be authorised to make any correction in the pattahs as proposed. Government do not think any alteration in the existing practice is called for.

42. Grant of pattahs to jenmies and not kudiyans in respect of Ayacut and other properties.

Mr. Narayanan Jatavedar Namburipad (Muvattupuzha) said that for all kanapattom and other lands belonging to jenmies, pattahs should be granted in their names only.

Reply.—Government do not think it desirable to alter the existing practice as it will give rise to numerous difficulties.

43. Certain irregularities in the Nanjanad settlement operations.

Mr R. Nambi Iyer (Tovala) brought forward this subject.

Reply.—The subject is vague. It is noted that the settlement of Nanjanad was completed years ago.

44. Certain defects in the new settlement and the necessity for some amendments in the existing procedure.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. K. Karunakaran Pillai (Parur) and Mr. C. Padmanabha Pillai (Karunagapalli) requested the attention of Government to this subject.

Reply.—This subject is also vague, but will be considered if a separate representation is made.

45. That a separate water-cess should not be levied on the lands that may be served by the Kodayar water.

Mr. R. Nambi Iyer (Tovala) said that all lands were originally punja and were converted into wet lands when channels were opened and other irrigational facilities afforded by Government to the ryots. Water-cess was already levied in Nanjanad and the land-owners would not be able to bear any additional tax as was proposed to be levied on account of the supply of Kodayar water for irrigation.

Mr. V. Sankaranarayana Iyer B. A., B. L., (Agastisvaram) the tax in Nanjanad was already high.

Mr. M. Madhavan Tampi (Kalkulam) said that if a correct account of the water-cess hitherto collected by Government from Nanjanad and Edanad were taken it would be found that 4 times the cost of the irrigation works had been already recovered. The ryots thus looked forward to a time when even the existing water-cess would be abolished and it was hard in the circumstances that they should be burdened with additional tax on that account.

Mr. P. Mathevan Pillai (Nanjinattar Sabha, Kottar) also spoke on the same subject.

Reply.—It has been already decided that when the Kodayar water is utilized by the ryots a water-cess shall be levied. The Project itself anticipated such a cess. It is not possible to alter that decision now. Details will be settled when the occasion actually arises.

The Assembly adjourned at 5 P. M. to 12 noon on Saturday the 5th January.

———:o:———

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly